

1 REMARKS

2 The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-
3 14, 16-21, and 23 in view of the arguments set forth below.

4
5 I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

6 The present application was originally filed with claims 1 through 24. Claim 24 was
7 cancelled and claim 25 was added in the response dated March 30, 2005. Claims 3, 7, 8, 15, 22,
8 and 25 are cancelled above. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-14, 16-21, and 23 remain pending in this case.

9
10 II. THE AMENDMENTS

11 Independent claims 1 and 6 are amended above to further specify the arrangement of
12 video displays in the gaming machines. In particular, claims 1 and 6 are amended to require four
13 video display devices at different positions at the front side of the gaming machine cabinet.
14 Support for these amendments is found in Figure 1 and the specification text associated with
15 Figure 1.

16 Independent method claim 14 is amended above to require displaying a game presentation
17 through four video displays. Support for these amendments is also found in Figure 1 and in the
18 specification text associated with that figure. In claim 14, the Applicants note particularly the
19 limitation added at element (d) that the first, second, third, and fourth game presentation
20 components combine to "produce the first game presentation." Support for this language is
21 found at page 9, lines 12-14 of the original disclosure which reads "[W]ith this separate player
22 control touch screen, the illustrated gaming machine 10 includes a total of four different video

1 displays that together provide the game presentation in the course of operation of the gaming
2 machine.”

3 Independent method claim 16 is amended above to require displaying a game presentation
4 with a series of four video displays located at a front side of the gaming machine in columnar
5 fashion. Support for this limitation is shown in Figure 1. Element (b) of claim 16 is amended
6 above to require producing a presentation switching instruction at least partially based on the
7 utilization of additional gaming machines included in the gaming system. Support for this
8 limitation is found in the original disclosure at the example described beginning at page 19, line
9 5.

10 The above amendments include an amendment to more clearly state the location of the
11 video displays as shown in Figure 1. For example, element (b) of claim 1 is amended to state
12 that the game video display is “located at” the front side of the cabinet. The previous claim
13 language required that the game video display was mounted on the front side of the cabinet. This
14 change in element (b) of claim 1 and the similar changes made elsewhere in the claims are
15 intended to clarify that limitation goes to the location of the respective video display on the
16 gaming machine as shown in Figure 1 and not to any particular manner in which the respective
17 display is physically mounted, that is, attached on or in the gaming machine cabinet.

18
19 III. THE CLAIMS ARE NOT INDEFINITE UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

20 The Office Action rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Although
21 the Applicants disagree with the rejection of claim 7 as being indefinite, claim 7 is cancelled
22 above in view of the amendment made to independent claim 6. The Applicants believe that the
23 cancellation of claim 7 obviates the §112 rejection set forth in the Final Office Action.

1 IV. THE CLAIMS AS AMENDED ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE PRIOR ART OF
2 RECORD IN THE CASE

3 The Final Office Action rejected Claims 1, 14, 16-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as
4 being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,135,884 to Hedrick et al. (the "884 patent" or the
5 "Hedrick patent"). Claims 1-5, 14-18, 20-23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
6 being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,620,047 to Alcorn et al. ("Alcorn" or the "Alcorn
7 patent") in view of the Hedrick patent. Claims 6-13, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §
8 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alcorn and Hedrick in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,335,809 to
9 Wain (the "Wain" or the "Wain patent"). The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as
10 amended are not anticipated by the Hedrick patent and are not obvious in view of the Hedrick
11 patent and the other art cited in the Final Office Action.

12 Independent claim 1 as amended requires four video display devices. In particular, claim
13 1 requires:

- 14 (1) a game video display located at a front side of the cabinet;
- 15 (2) a first additional video display located at the front side of the cabinet above the
16 game video display, the first additional video display making up substantially the
17 entire area of a front side of the gaming machine above the game video display;
- 18 (3) a player control touch screen display located below the game video display at the
19 front side of the cabinet and extending substantially the entire width of the front
20 side of the gaming machine, the player control touch screen forming a portion of a
21 forwardly projecting ledge located below the game video display and extending
22 transversely to a plane of the game video display; and

1 (4) a second additional video display located at the front side of the cabinet below the
2 player control touch screen display, the second additional video display extending
3 substantially the entire width of the front side of the gaming machine in an area
4 below the player control touch screen display.

5 The Hedrick patent, on which the Final Office Action depends for showing multiple video
6 displays in a gaming machine, does not teach or suggest this configuration of video displays in a
7 gaming machine. The Alcorn and Wain patents in no way make up for this deficiency in the
8 Hedrick patent with regard to the configuration of video displays now required in claim 1.
9 Because the references of record in the case do not teach or suggest each limitation set out in
10 claim 1, the Applicants believe claim 1 is entitled to allowance together with its respective
11 dependent claims, claims 2, 4, and 5.

12 The Applicants note that the Final Office Action at the first full paragraph of page 6 cites
13 the Alcorn patent as disclosing a player control touch screen display forming a portion of a
14 forwardly projecting ledge located below the game video display. The Final Office Action also
15 references Alcorn at Col. 3, lines 42-46; Figure 3; and Col. 4, lines 13-25 in support of the
16 contention regarding the player control touch screen display. However, nothing in the Alcorn
17 reference, including the particular points of Alcorn cited in the Final Office Action, teaches or
18 suggests a player control touch screen display in a plane projecting forwardly from the plane of a
19 game video display. In contrast, the only player control touch screen disclosed in Alcorn is
20 simply a lower part of the game video display as shown in Figure 3 of Alcorn. Figure 2 of
21 Alcorn also clearly shows that the touch screen is in the area 19 of the single display device in the
22 Alcorn gaming machine, and certainly does not form a portion of a ledge extending transverse to
23 the plane of the game video display.

1 Independent claim 6 is amended above to require a configuration of four video displays
2 similar to that required in claim 1. The above comments as to claim 1 thus apply with equal
3 force to claim 6. The Applicants therefore submit that claim 6 is also entitled to allowance
4 together with its respective dependent claims, claims 9-13.

5 Method claim 14 as amended above requires displaying four game presentation
6 components each with a respective video display. These four game presentation components
7 combine to produce an entire game presentation. None of the references of record in the present
8 case, either taken alone or as properly combined, teach or suggest all of the limitations set out in
9 claim 14 as amended. The Applicants therefore submit that claim 14 is entitled to allowance.

10 Method claim 16 is amended above to not only require displaying a first game
11 presentation through a series of four video displays arranged in columnar fashion, but also
12 producing a presentation switching instruction to cause the displays to switch from displaying a
13 first game presentation to a second game presentation. The presentation switching instruction is
14 at least partially based on the utilization of different gaming machines that provide the second
15 game presentation. None of the references of record in this case teach or suggest using four
16 video display devices to provide alternatively a first and second game presentation. Furthermore,
17 none of the references of record in the case teach or suggest producing a presentation switching
18 instruction at least partially based on the utilization of additional gaming machines which
19 provide a different game presentation different. Because the prior art of record in the case does
20 not teach or suggest all of the elements required in claim 16, the Applicants believe that claim 16
21 is entitled to allowance together with its respective dependent claims, claims 17-20.

22 Claim 21 is directed to a gaming machine having three video displays, a game video
23 display, a player control video display forming a portion of a forwardly projecting ledge below

1 the game video display, and a first additional video display located above the game video display.
2 The prior art of record in the present case does not teach or suggest this arrangement of video
3 display devices in a gaming machine. The Applicants therefore submit that claim 21 is entitled
4 to allowance together with its dependent claim, claim 23.
5

6 V. THE CONCURRENTLY FILED INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

7 In the course of preparing a response to the Final Office Action, the Applicants conducted
8 additional searching for references that may be relevant to the present invention. Concurrently
9 filed with this amendment and Request for Continued Examination is an additional Information
10 Disclosure Statement disclosing additional references located in that additional searching. The
11 Applicants submit that the claims as amended above are not anticipated or rendered obvious in
12 view of these additional references and the prior art already of record in the present case.
13

1 VI. CONCLUSION

2 For all of the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and
3 allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-14, 16-21, and 23. If the Examiner should feel that any issue
4 remains as to the allowability of these claims, or that a conference might expedite allowance of
5 the claims, the Examiner is asked to telephone the Applicants' attorney Russell D. Culbertson at
6 the number listed below.

7 Respectfully submitted,


8 The Culbertson Group, P.C.

9
10
11
12
13 Dated: 22 December 2005 By: 

14 Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124
15 Trevor Lind, Reg. No. 54,785
16 1114 Lost Creek Boulevard, Suite 420
17 Austin, Texas 78746
18 (512)327.8932
19 ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS
20

21
22 CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

23 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, (Fax
24 No. 571-273-8300) on December 22, 2005.

25
26
27
28 Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124 
29
30

1039_Response_OA 050921.wpd